Message

From: Steve Li [xzl0004@auburn.edu]
Sent: 7/25/2020 7:02:51 PM
To: Hathaway, Margaret [Hathaway.Margaret@epa.gov]
CC: Kenny, Daniel [Kenny.Dan@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Deatsville 2019 Research Questions

Flag: Follow up

Hi Meg,

Glad to hear from you. Sorry for my late response. I have been too busy with field work and some other paperwork lately. I provided answer under each of your question.

We repeated EV Smith study this year at another location using same treatments/blocks, plus a new pH buffer block. Data of this study will be available in early August if EPA likes to review it. We also have seen several compounds giving amazing performance to reduce dicamba volatility in our greenhouse and field trials (8-10 fold reduction). Deatsville and EV Smith REC both have large scale field trials this summer.

Thanks,
Steve

From: Hathaway, Margaret <Hathaway.Margaret@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2020 7:47 PM
To: Steve Li <xzl0004@auburn.edu>
Cc: Kenny, Daniel <Kenny.Dan@epa.gov>
Subject: Deatsville 2019 Research Questions

Hello Dr. Li:
EFED is hoping that you can help with some questions they have regarding your Deatsville dicamba research from 2019. Please let me know if anything is unclear about what they are asking.

The questions are as follows:

1. From the information we have, it looks like two separate studies were conducted in Deatsville in 2019 – one that started on June 26th and one that started on August 6th, is that correct?

Yes, two separate studies. Deatsville study was sprayed on June 26th. The other study conducted at EV Smith Research and Extension Center on Aug 6th. These two locations are probably 30 miles from each other.

2. Were the plots treated in both studies the same?

Plots treated at both location were 5 acre block. Deatsville trial had DP 1646 cotton in spray block. EV Smith REC trial had Xtend soybean in spray block.

3. What type of equipment was used to make the application?

Deatsville: JD 6700 self-propelled sprayer (covers~40 ft width under each pass). EV Smith REC: 3 point hitch towing sprayer that covers 4 rows/12 ft under each pass)

4. The study that happened on June 26th
    a. Only involved applications of Xtendimax plus Roundup plus Intact, correct?

3-way mix block: Roundup PM 32 oz + Xtendimax 22 oz + Intact 0.5% v/v. Sprayed with TTI 11004 @ 15 GPA

    b. What application rates were used?

See answer above

    c. Was only one plot treated? The powerpoint seems to indicate maybe three plots (West block 1, West block 2, and 3-way), but the bioassay data seem to indicate it was just one field, the 3-way, with three replicates along each transect at each distance.

Only 3-way mix block has sensitive bioassay transacts around it. West block 1 and 2 did not have bioassays. We could only do one block due to insufficient plants and greenhouse space.

d. We see plant bioassay data from this study, but no air concentration data or spray drift data. Were air concentration data or spray drift data collected and are they available?

I know we have air samplers for the 3-way mix block and collected PUFs during first 72 hrs. However, Bayer Cropscience has those samples. Please contact them (or Ryan Rector) for air concentration and spray drift data.

e. Was any weather data available for this study? Notes for this study in a Word document indicate a Ryan Rector's weather data and air sampling data, but we haven't received those.

Weather data should be available but Ryan Rector from Bayer Cropscience has it. You may can ask him about this question too.

5. The study that was done on August 6th
   a. Involved one plot treated with Xtendimax plus Roundup plus Intact and one plot treated with Xtendimax plus Roundup plus Vaporgrip X plus Intact (Bayer field), correct?

Correct. One block has the same 3-way mix as the Deatsville block. The other one has Xtendimax 22 oz + RUP PM 32 oz + Intact 0.5% plus additional 1% vaporgrip.

b. We have air concentration and spray drift data for this study, but no bioassay data. Were bioassay data collected for this study? There are drone photos and GIS data, so it may be in that dataset, I have not been able to assess it yet.

Negative. We did not take bioassay data in transacts because we decided to use total affected area calculated by the minimal injury line. You can see the minimal injury line from the GIS data.

As always, thank you for your time and any assistance you may be able to provide.

Take care,
Meg

Margaret Hathaway (Meg)
Senior Regulatory Specialist
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
OCSPP: Office of Pesticide Programs
Registration Division – Herbicide Branch
hathaway.margaret@epa.gov
(703) 305-5076